

Gaither, Stephenson, Nelson, Stewart of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Schley, Brewer, Weber, Parke and Brown—18.

So the amendment was adopted.

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. THOMAS, to insert in said section after the word "every" in the second line, the word "second."

Mr. T. then modified his amendment, by moving to amend said section by inserting after the word "day" in the second line, the words "in the year eighteen hundred and fifty-four."

The Convention now became involved in a long conversational discussion, (chiefly verbal and technical,) as to the effect and operation of the amendment, and its probable conflict with the vote of the Convention, already given on the subject of biennial sessions;

Messrs. CHAMBERS, of Kent, THOMAS, PHELPS, BUCHANAN and SPENCER, taking part therein.

And pending the question,

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow morning at eleven o'clock.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

The following are the remarks referred to in the last number, made on the presentation by Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, of his report on the basis of representation:

Mr. PRESSTMAN desired to inquire of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) by what rule he and those of the committee who had united with him in the report just submitted, had arrived at the number of representatives to compose the House of Delegates. His reason for propounding the inquiry was, to ascertain the whole scope and object of the report, that it might be fully understood and reflected upon. If it be said that the rule adopted was to settle the basis upon the compromise act, as it was termed, of 1836, he wished to call the attention of the Convention to the fact, that this report sought to make no change in the basis of representation already guaranteed by that act, in favor of the principle of popular representation, but that it actually condemned that compromise by seeking to destroy the advantages secured by the federal basis. He wished to be informed what was the reason of this departure in that particular alone from the rule, if it could be so called, in the act of 1836.

He begged to invite the serious reflection of the Convention to the disposition manifested in that report, while it did not yield any thing to the white population of the State beyond what was secured by the act to which he had referred, sought to engraft a provision new in its character in the history of this State, or of any other in the Union, viz: That the aggregate vote of the population, including every negro, free or slave, was to compose the basis. This surely would be regarded as a retrograde movement by the great body of the people of Maryland. As a representative in part of the city of Baltimore, he had early announced his willingness to adjust this question of representation upon a fair principle

of compromise. He could not refrain, however, from saying that he regretted to find that any gentleman should desire to settle the basis of representation upon a principle such as that contained in the report just submitted—which not only refused any concession to the people of Western Maryland and to his constituency, comprising of themselves nearly one-fourth of the population of the State—but offended their sense of justice and right, by seeking to place the entire negro population of the State upon an equality with them, so far as constituting the basis of representation. In truth what could be more abhorrent, that while Baltimore with her white population, numbering nearly one hundred and forty-two thousand souls, was limited to a representation of six delegates, every slave in Maryland should be considered as worthy to constitute in part the basis of representation. More than that, sir, the county of Kent, with but a five thousand, five hundred and ninety-five white population, has granted her in this report three delegates.

He had sought the information from the gentleman from Kent, perhaps in a manner somewhat irregular, but inasmuch as the gentleman from Charles, (Mr. Merrick,) the distinguished Chairman of the committee, had in presenting his report accompanied it with the expression that each separate report of the committee, as well as his own, looked to the establishment of a rule of apportionment, and such also had been announced by the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard) as his object in the report he had submitted. These observations had induced him to propound the question.

Mr. CHAMBERS. The gentleman, (Mr. Presstman,) has asked a question "by what rule we have arrived at the number of representatives indicated in the report." The question cannot be more satisfactorily answered, than by again reading the report.

"Every county having a population of less than 15,000 shall be entitled to three delegates; every county having a population of 15,000 and less than 25,000, shall be entitled to four delegates; every county having 25,000 and less than 35,000, to five, and every county having more than 35,000, to six; and Baltimore city the same number as the largest county."

The gentleman's question, he hoped, was answered fully. But the gentleman had gone far beyond asking a question. Indeed, his question seemed to have been put, not at all because he did not comprehend the rule suggested by the report, but merely as a prelude to an assault upon it. It was certainly a very unusual course, when a report on an important measure was made, at the instant of its presentation, before it was printed, or in possession of the House, to commence an attack upon it. The same gentleman had some time since gratuitously assumed the task of protecting the rights and interests of the slave-holding portions of the State, had volunteered and earnestly pressed a measure designed to manifest a very warm feeling toward this interest. This was the first instance in which the rights of the slaveholder, as such, had since then been presented to the consideration of the House,